



RECEIVED

AUG 18 2004 7217/65965

REMARKS Technology Center 2100

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 remain in the application and have been amended hereby with claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 having been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the drawings.

Submitted herewith are replacement sheets for Figs. 1-4 in which the legend "Prior Art" has been added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The independent claims have been amended hereby in an effort to be more clear concerning what is being recited at the objected-to location in the claims. As explained in the present specification at page 10, for example, the processing results of the present processing time, which are found for the 2ⁿ states from the parallel processing of the processing results obtained at the immediately preceding processing time for the 2ⁿ states are written back to a memory area that was used for storing the processing results obtained at that immediately preceding processing time.

The claims have been amended to now recite that each of the plurality of processing units perform parallel processing of a plurality of computation results obtained for 2ⁿ states with one of a plurality of processing timings immediately preceding a present timing of the plurality of processing timings to obtain the computation results for the 2ⁿ states.

It is respectfully submitted that upon a close reading of

the claims as amended hereby the claims are clear in their recitation regarding using results of the immediately preceding computations in making the present computations.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clear and definite in their recitation of the present invention and meet all requirements of 35 USC 112.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Mizuno et al. in view of Ikeda.

In paragraph 8. of the instant official action, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended hereby to include claim 2 in its entirety. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 3 has been amended to include claim 4 in its entirety. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claim 5 has been amended hereby to include claim 6 in its entirety. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 7 has been amended to include claim 8 in its entirety. Claim 8 has been cancelled.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the independent claims to include allowable subject matter and the cancellation of the dependent claims, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining in this application are now in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jay H. Maioli". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "J" and "M".

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:gr